

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE
NASHVILLE DIVISION**

BRISTOL REGIONAL WOMEN'S CENTER,)	
P.C., et al.,)	
)	
)	
Plaintiffs,)	
)	
)	
v.)	
)	
)	
HERBERT H. SLATERY III, et al.,)	
)	
)	
Defendants.)	

MOTION FOR A STAY PENDING APPEAL

Under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 62(d), Defendants Herbert H. Slatery III; Lisa Piercey, M.D.; W. Reeves Johnson, Jr., M.D.; Glenn R. Funk; Amy Weirich; Barry P. Staubus; and Charme Allen, in their official capacities, move this Court to stay its October 14, 2020 permanent injunction pending appeal. (*See* D.E. 275, 276). Pursuant to Local Rule 7.01, Plaintiffs have been consulted and object to this motion.

A court must consider four factors to decide whether to stay an injunction pending appeal: “(1) whether the stay applicant has made a strong showing that he is likely to succeed on the merits; (2) whether the applicant will be irreparably injured absent a stay; (3) whether issuance of the stay will substantially injure the other parties interested in the proceeding; and (4) where the public interest lies.” *Thompson v. Dewine*, 959 F.3d 804, 807 (6th Cir. 2020) (quoting *Nken v. Holder*, 556 U.S. 418, 434 (2009)). Here, all four factors favor a stay.

First, Defendants are likely to succeed on appeal. Tennessee’s waiting-period law does not violate the constitutional right to abortion. States may regulate abortion to further their legitimate interests, including protecting maternal health and the lives of unborn children. *Planned*

Parenthood of Se. Pennsylvania v. Casey, 505 U.S. 833, 871-76 (1992) (joint opinion of O'Connor, Kennedy, and Souter, JJ.). To that end, Tennessee and other States across the country have enacted waiting-period laws. These laws ensure that prospective abortion patients have time to weigh their options, consider alternatives to abortion, and make a fully informed decision. *See id.* at 872-73.

Recognizing these important interests, federal courts have consistently upheld waiting-period laws. *E.g.*, *Cincinnati Women's Servs., Inc. v. Taft*, 468 F.3d 361, 366, 372-74 (6th Cir. 2006); *Karlin v. Foust*, 188 F.3d 446, 486 (7th Cir. 1999) (collecting cases). Indeed, the Supreme Court upheld a waiting-period law that was nearly identical to Tennessee's even though the law made it more expensive and time-consuming to obtain abortions. *Casey*, 505 U.S. at 885-87 (joint opinion).

The permanent injunction issued in this case conflicts with this longstanding precedent. The injunction is also erroneous under the Sixth Circuit's recent decision in *EMW Women's Surgical Center, P.S.C. v. Friedlander*, --- F.3d ---, 2020 WL 6111008, at *10 (6th Cir. Oct. 16, 2020), which clarified the test for evaluating abortion regulations in light of *Jane Medical Services L.L.C. v. Russo*, 140 S. Ct. 2103 (2020). For these reasons, the State will likely succeed in having the injunction reversed on appeal.

The other factors also warrant a stay. *See Nken*, 556 U.S. at 434. The State will be irreparably injured absent a stay because it will be wrongfully enjoined from enforcing a duly enacted law that protects women and unborn children. *See Abbott v. Perez*, 138 S. Ct. 2305, 2324 & n.17 (2018); *Maryland v. King*, 567 U.S. 1301, 1303 (2012) (Roberts, C.J., in chambers). And a stay will not injure the other parties to the proceeding: the abortion providers have been complying with Tennessee's waiting-period law for the entire pendency of this five-year litigation and there is no reason they cannot continue to comply during the appellate proceedings. Finally, the public interest favors enforcing the people of Tennessee's lawful policy choices. *See*

Thompson, 959 F.3d at 812; *Coal. to Defend Affirmative Action v. Granholm*, 473 F.3d 237, 252 (6th Cir. 2006).

CONCLUSION

This Court should stay its October 14, 2020 permanent injunction pending resolution of the State's appeal.

Respectfully submitted,

HERBERT H. SLATERY III
Attorney General and Reporter

/s/ Alexander S. Rieger
ALEXANDER S. RIEGER (BPR #029362)
Assistant Attorney General
alex.rieger@ag.tn.gov

STEVEN A. HART (BPR #07050)
Special Counsel
steve.hart@ag.tn.gov

MATTHEW D. CLOUTIER (BPR #036710)
Assistant Attorney General
matt.cloutier@ag.tn.gov

Office of the Tennessee Attorney General
Public Interest Division
P.O. Box 20207
Nashville, TN 37202
(615) 741-7908

Attorneys for Defendants

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and exact copy of the foregoing Motion has been served on the following counsel of record through the Electronic Filing System on this 4th day of November, 2020:

Scott P. Tift
David W. Garrison
Barrett Johnston Martin & Garrison, LLC,
Bank of America Plaza,
414 Union Street, Suite 900
Nashville, TN 37219
stift@barrettjohnson.com
dgarrison@barrettjohnson.com

Thomas C. Jessee
Jessee & Jessee
P.O. Box 997
Johnson City, TN 37605
jjlaw@jesseeandjessee.com

Autumn Katz
Hailey Flynn
Michelle Moriarty
Marc Hearron
Genevieve Scott
Center for Reproductive Rights
199 Water Street, 22nd Floor
New York, NY 10038
akatz@reprorights.org
hflynn@reprorights.org
mmoriarty@reprorights.org
gscott@reprorights.org

Maithreyi Ratakonda
Melissa Cohen
Planned Parenthood Federation of
America
123 William St., 9th Floor
New York, NY 10038
mai.ratakonda@ppfa.org
melissa.cohen@ppfa.org

Michael J. Dell
Jason M. Moff
Irene Weintraub
Timur Tusiray
Kramer Levin Naftalis & Frankel LLP
1177 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10036
mdell@kramerlevin.com
jmoff@kramerlevin.com
iweintraub@kramerlevin.com
ttusiray@kramerlevin.com

Thomas H. Castelli
American Civil Liberties Union
PO Box 120160
Nashville, TN 37212
tcastelli@aclu-tn.org

Julia Kaye
American Civil Liberties Union Foundation
125 Broad St. Floor 18
New York, NY 10004
jkaye@aclu.org

Date: November 4, 2020

/s/ Alexander S. Rieger
ALEXANDER S. RIEGER
Assistant Attorney General